

Serial No. 10/710,624  
Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005  
Amendment Dated March 29, 2005

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested. Claims 22 - 36 are pending. By this amendment, claims 22 and 30 have been amended and claims 37 - 41 have been cancelled.

**Specification**

The Cross Reference to Related Applications" paragraph has been amended to update the status of United States Patent Application serial No. 10/336,975 and to refer to United States Patent No. 6,640,457 as suggested by the Office Action.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

Claims 37 - 41 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

**Drawings**

Claims 37 - 41 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

The Office Action Rejected claims 22, 25, 30 and 32 were rejected as being anticipated by Lenon et al. ('373)

As amended, Claim 22 recites that the visually perceptible marking corresponds to the initial pull up position. Lenon does not show or suggest a marking that corresponds to an initial pull up position. Claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 25 depends from claim 22 and is in condition for allowance.

As amended, Claim 30 recites that the visually perceptible marking corresponds to the initial pull up position. Lenon does not show or suggest this feature. Claim 30 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 32 depends from claim 30 and is also in condition for allowance.

**Double Patenting**

The Office Action included double patenting rejections of claims 22-36 based on U.S. Patent Nos. 6,279,242; 6,640,457; 6,502,323; and 6,766,582. Applicant's attorney, Ken Smith,

Serial No. 10/710,624  
Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2005  
Amendment Dated March 29, 2005

and Examiner Christopher Fulton conducted a brief telephone interview regarding the double patenting rejections based on U.S. Patent Nos. 6,279,242 and 6,640,457. Examiner Fulton indicated that the double patenting rejections based on U.S. Patent Nos. 6,279,242 and 6,640,457 were intended to be obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Terminal disclaimers in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) are attached to overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejections. Claims 22-36 are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/28/05

By: Ken Smith

Kenneth J. Smith, Reg. No. 45,115  
(216) 622-8674